



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,862	11/08/2001	L. Mark Ernest	FIS9-2000-0304	2036
George R. Pettit Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz LLP P.O. Box 19088 Washington, DC 20036-3425			EXAMINER BOSWELL, BETH V	
			ART UNIT 3623	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/13/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/005,862	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ERNEST ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Beth V. Boswell	<b>Art Unit</b> 3623	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) Beth V. Boswell.

(2) Arlene Neal.

**Date of Interview:** 3 August 2010

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☐ No  
If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

  

Claims discussed:  
Claims 13 and 16

Prior art documents discussed:

  

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  

/Beth V. Boswell/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623

**Status of Application:** After Decision by BPAI

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner called applicant's representative in July 2010 about the Board Decision dated 01/21/2010 in which the Board of Appeals reversed the examiner's rejection with respect to claims 13 and 16, but affirmed examiner's rejection with respect to claims 14-15, which depend from claim 13. Examiner requested that claim 16 be rolled into claim 12 in order to make the record clearer. Applicant's representative stated that she would contact the Applicant and get back in touch with Examiner. No response was received so examiner called Applicant's representative on 8/3/2010 and left a voicemail requesting a return phone call. No response has been received..